

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING
October 15, 2013 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Present:

Members:

Janet Langdell, Chairperson
Paul Amato
Kathy Bauer
Chris Beer
Steve Duncanson
Judy Plant
Tom Sloan

Staff:

Jodie Levandowski, Town Planner
Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary
Bill Parker, Community Development Director
Zach Steinbrecher, Videographer

Susan Robinson, Alternate member

PRESENTATION:

1. **2013 Distinguished Site Award**

PUBLIC HEARING:

Per NH RSA 675:6, the Milford Planning Board will hold a public hearing for the following:

2. **2014-2019 Capital Improvements Plan**
3. **Proposed revisions and amendments to the Milford Gravel and Earth Removal Regulations**

MINUTES:

4. Approval of minutes from the 9/17/13 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

5. **Lawrence S. & Brenda Cassidy, Trustees – 101-103 Souhegan St – Map 27, Lot 39;** Public Hearing for a proposed subdivision creating one (1) new residential lot with less than the required frontage on a Class V road or better in the Residence A District, as approved by the Milford ZBA and to consider waiver requests from Development Regulations Section 5.06, Submittal Requirements:

- 1) 5.06.I, Property Boundary Lines,
- 2) 5.06.K, Delineation of wetlands and buffers,
- 3) 5.06.L, Delineation of slopes over 25%.

New application – Todd Land Use Consultants, LLC

6. **Creative Investors – Melendy Rd – Map 47, Lots 5, 5-1 & 6;**

- 1) Public Hearing for the design review of a proposed six (6) lot residential subdivision.
- 2) Public Hearing for a proposed lot line adjustment and open space subdivision creating three (3) new residential lots.

New application – Fieldstone Land Consultants

OLD BUSINESS:

7. **St. Joseph Hospital – Nashua St – Map 31, Lot 32; Design review of a new medical building with associated site improvements.**

Tabled from the 8/20/13 meeting

Chairperson Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:30PM. She then explained the process for the public hearing, introduced the Board and Staff, and read the agenda.

PRESENTATION:

2013 Distinguished Site Award

Chairperson Langdell explained the process and said that the Planning Board wanted to find a way to recognize outstanding business locations in town. Milford is a vibrant community that is enhanced by so many businesses that choose to operate in our community.

The nominees were;

Balance Point Natural Medicine on Nashua St;

Repeat nominees: Giorgio's Restaurant;

Merrill's Convenience;

United Auto Body;

Hitchiner Manufacturing, Co. nominated twice, for the new building on Elm St and the "White house" on Old Wilton Rd;

JP Pest Services also received two nominations, for the new corporate training center on Hammond Rd and their original location on Emerson Rd

J. Langdell presented the 2013 award to JP Pest Services for the Hammond Rd facility. The nomination stated that the JP Pest building on Hammond Rd was designed to complement the building on Emerson Rd. It boasts a portico entrance with granite posts, a circular drive and a cupola. This is the company's corporate training center and provides opportunity for other events. The site is beautifully landscaped and designed and is a pleasant sight from the 101 bypass. She also added that this site enhances the visual aspect along one of the gateways to Milford. JP Pest Services started in Amherst, moved to Milford and is now multi-state; it is a tremendous success story.

Joe Pestana and Chris Pestana accepted the award. J. Pestana thanked the Planning Board and said we moved to Milford in 1997 and that was a catalyst for our company to take off and grow over the years. Milford has been good to us and hopefully we've been good for the Town; a win-win situation. J. Langdell added that the business was good for the Souhegan Valley and JP Pest Services joins distinguished past recipients; Ciardelli Fuel Company, Milford Veterinary Hospital and the French House.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairperson Langdell read the notice for the 2014-2019 Capital Improvements Plan into the record and recognized Paul Dargie, Chair of the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) Advisory Committee.

P. Dargie acknowledged the other committee members: Joe O'Neil, Rose Evans, Steve Duncanson, Judy Plant, Tim Finan and Matt Lydon. The 2014-2019 CIP plan was reviewed by the Planning Board at a prior worksession and also by the Board of Selectmen. He gave a synopsis of the CIP process and said the plan is to grow the expenditures, but to keep the tax impact smooth, without spikes from year to year. He then highlighted the five projects on the Priority Project Listing and Recommendations for 2014 Town Warrant and Budget Considerations by priority.

1. Fire Department – Ladder 1 replacement - \$770,000, 7 year lease
2. DPW – Variety of bridge improvement projects - \$250,000
3. DPW – Sidewalk tractor/plow with sander - \$95,000, 3 year lease
4. DPW – Dump truck with plow and sander assembly - \$144, 000, 5 year lease
5. Administration – Town Hall renovations - \$500,000, 10 year bond

J. Langdell said while this committee is essentially a sub-committee of the Planning Board, we do want to keep open lines of communication with the Board of Selectmen; however, the purpose of this committee is to get citizens' input for the priorities of the town. Copies are available in Town Hall and online.

J. Langdell opened discussion to the public. There being no comment, the public portion of the meeting was closed. There were no comments from the Board.

S. Duncanson made a motion to approve the 2014-2019 CIP plan. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor.

Chairperson Langdell read the notice for the Proposed revisions and amendments to the Milford Gravel and Earth Removal Regulations into the record.

J. Langdell said that process was started back in January of this year when Jodie took on the task of updating the Town's gravel and earth removal regulations. This was pursuant to some change that came about in the RSA's at the State level. Certain language has been revised so that we are in accordance with the RSAs.

There were no comments from the Board.

J. Langdell opened discussion to the public and stated that the document has been available online and in the office for review. There being no comment, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

P. Amato made a motion to adopt the proposed revisions and amendments to the Milford Gravel and Earth Removal Regulations as presented. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

MINUTES:

K. Bauer made a motion to table the minutes from the 9/17/13 meeting to the next meeting. P. Amato seconded and all in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

Lawrence S. & Brenda Cassidy, Trustees – 101-103 Souhegan St – Map 27, Lot 39; Public Hearing for a proposed subdivision creating one (1) new residential lot with less than the required frontage on a Class V road or better in the Residence A District, as approved by the Milford ZBA and to consider waiver requests from Development Regulations Section 5.06, Submittal Requirements: 5.06.I, Property Boundary Lines, 5.06.K, Delineation of wetlands and buffers, and 5.06.L, Delineation of slopes over 25%.

No abutters were present.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Robert Todd, Todd Land Use Consultants

Lawrence Cassidy, Owner

J. Langdell noted that the application was complete, per Staff. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. C. Beer seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

R. Todd presented plans dated 9/13/13 and explained the features of the site and the three different deed tracts that make up this parcel. It is considered one tax parcel from the Town's standpoint and assembled on the tax map as one parcel. Both the existing house that sits within the front setback and the mobile home that was replaced in 2006 are on tract 1. A variance was granted for this subdivision in February, 2013. We have surveyed the perimeter of tracts 1, 2 and 4 but the larger tract 3 was scaled from the tax map and deed descriptions. There is a wetland strip that runs mostly under the PSNH easement which has been digitized from aerial photography but not surveyed. There are also some culvert crossings with considerable flow that run under Souhegan St into the wetland area. The new lot has woodland buffer and the larger lot has some open area near the river. Each lot has their own driveways and utility connections. L. Cassidy added that the water, sewer and electrical lines were installed by Dave Wheeler when the mobile home was replaced and are all in one trench. A brief discussion regarding the layout followed. R. Todd noted that only one area with slopes greater than 25% was shown on the plan. The base flood elevation line is shown running parallel to the river but won't affect any improvements on the property. We have applied for three (3) waivers sections 5.06.I, 5.06.K, 5.06.L and explained that there are no plans to further develop this property. We also acknowledge and agree with the staff recommendations.

There were no comments from the Board.

Chairperson Langdell opened the hearing to the public; there being no comments, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

P. Amato said the waiver requests were explained very well and granting the three waivers would not have an adverse effect on this subdivision. J. Langdell said this is a very unique parcel and agreed.

P. Amato made a motion to grant all three waivers from Development Regulations; Section 5.06, Submittal Requirements: 5.06.I, Property Boundary Lines, 5.06.K, Delineation of wetlands and buffers, and 5.06.L, Delineation of slopes over 25%. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

J. Langdell reviewed the staff memo dated 10/15/13 and stated that the waivers should be added to the plan.

P. Amato made a motion to grant approval of the application subject to the staff recommendations on the Staff Memo dated 10/15/13. J. Plant seconded and all in favor.

R. Todd inquired about the timeframe for the completion of the conditions. J. Levandowski answered that the applicant has one year to complete the conditions and have the plan signed.

Creative Investors – Melendy Rd – Map 47, Lots 5, 5-1 & 6;

Public Hearing for the design review of a proposed six (6) lot residential subdivision

Abutters present:

Curtis Pomerleau, Melendy Rd

Bohdan Zaryckyj, Melendy Rd

Paul Barlow, Melendy Rd

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, LLC

Kent Chappell, Creative Investors

Nate Ball, Ball Design-Build, LLC

Chairperson Langdell read the notice of hearing for the design review into the record. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. C. Beer seconded and all in favor. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record for both applications.

C. Branon presented plans dated 9/16/13 on behalf of Creative Investors and described the project. The three existing parcels are in the Residence R District with a total 15.19 acres of land and 574.11 linear ft of frontage along Melendy Rd. Two (2) of the three (3) lots have been developed with single family homes and he referenced the conventional layout plan. The proposal is to combine lots 47/5, 5-1 & 6 and re-subdivide into six (6) single family residential lots. The development will have to comply with the Open Space subdivision requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, so the conventional subdivision plan was submitted and the layout does support a density of six (6) lots. It meets all development requirements and we will not require any waivers, special exceptions or variances. The proposed road meets all grade requirements and all lots will meet the driveway regulations as well. When we first started work on this project, we had proven out seven (7) lots, but after review with the client he felt that a six (6) lot layout would be more adequate for this property.

P. Amato said a density of six lots on 15 acres makes sense.

C. Beer asked how long the dead end road was on the conventional subdivision plan. C. Branon replied approximately 700 ft in length and the regulations state 1,000ft.

Chairperson Langdell opened the meeting for public input relative to the design review.

B. Zaryckyj said my property actually has Ox Brook running through it, so one of my concerns is what are we exactly going to do with the storm runoff because I don't need any more runoff. C. Branon said it is our charge,

per the regulations, to mitigate any increases in runoff as a result of the development. We are proposing two basins that will promote infiltration and meter the flow out of the basin so that it doesn't exceed the peak rates of flow that currently exist. The design will be completely compliant with all regulations. We met with DPW and the Environmental Coordinator and we are addressing all comments and concerns. We feel most are minor in nature and there will be no offsite impacts resulting from this project. There are also number of additional elements and components to the drainage design as shown on the plan.

J. Langdell closed the public portion of the hearing.

P. Amato made a motion that the applicant has met the density for six (6) lots. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Duncanson made a motion to close the public hearing for the design review. P. Amato seconded and all in favor.

Creative Investors – Melendy Rd – Map 47, Lots 5, 5-1 & 6;

Public Hearing for a proposed lot line adjustment and open space subdivision creating three (3) new residential lots

Abutters present:

Curtis Pomerleau, Melendy Rd

Bohdan, Melendy Rd

Paul Barlow, Melendy Rd

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, LLC

Kent Chappell, Creative Investors

Nate Ball, Ball Design-Build, LLC

Chairperson Langdell read the notice of hearing for the open space subdivision application into the record. C. Beer made a motion to accept the final application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell explained that determination has already been made regarding regional impact and the abutters list has been entered into the record as part of the design review application.

C. Branon said the open space plan depicts six (6) lots ranging from .732 acres to 6.367 acres and they all meet the dimensional requirements as outlined in the Ordinance. The lots will be serviced by underground electric, on site wells and septic systems. The 20' wide road meets all design requirements and includes a 50' ROW and a 450' hammerhead. The drainage, shown on sheet 3, will incorporate two infiltration / detention basins that will mitigate all runoff generated from the development. Sheet 1 shows the drainage and opens space easements. The open space for this development will be handled by easements and each owner will own a portion of the open space but there will be restrictions with customary open space language. Per regulations, this development is required to place 40% of the property, 6.08 acres, into the open space of which 50% or 3.04 acres has to contain no wetland and non-steep slopes. This proposal places 10 acres of land in open space, 66% of the property and of that 6.36 acres is non-wet and non-steep slopes which exceeds the requirement of well over 100%. The proposed layout certainly meets the intent of the open space ordinance and what we've tried to do is develop the front side of the property where the mild slopes are located which allowed us to put all the jurisdictional wetlands within the open space.

S. Duncanson said it looks like you are incorporating the open space into the calculation of the size of the lot. C. Branon replied that the open space is technically an easement on the individual lot areas. The open space notation depicts the total of 9.998 acres and the open space is included on the individual lots. P. Amato noted that the person who buys lot 47/5-3 will singly own that portion of the open space. C. Branon said yes, these would be larger lots, but would be restricted. It's just a matter of how it lays out and ideally one could balance out the lot sizes better, but the intent of the open space is satisfied as we are still preserving 9.998 acres. He then referenced the Conservation Commission memo dated 10/14/13 and said we are not interested in the first option of deeding the open space to the Commission, but we would be in favor of their second option to manage the open space. They would essentially be the holder of the easement and manage and enforce the permitted uses; passive recreation and forest management. We will use the standard conservation easement language that NH DES uses.

P. Amato said the owner would be taxed on the whole lot but couldn't use the land and they will have people walking on their property. C. Branon said per an example from the Conservation Commission, the owner can restrict the location of the trail on the property. The nice thing about this open space is that it is bisected by wetlands, so it's kind of a natural boundary to somebody's backyard. This form of ownership is compliant with the Zoning Ordinance and one of the main reasons we're proposing this is that were still in a market that isn't solid. The only way to put this land into a separate parcel would be if there was a homeowners association and that really impacts the marketability of a development. People also like to own more property and although this open space land, as stated would be taxable, it could potentially help the tax base to have larger, restricted lots. There would be covenants in the deeds and a reference to the easement. P. Amato said the lot line and useable area for lot 47/5-2 is less clear. How would you delineate that on the ground so that the owner would know where the open space is and doesn't mow the lawn and dump leaves there. C. Branon said that's where management by the local Conservation Commission may not be a bad idea, because they will likely do an annual inspection and make sure the people are not doing what was brought up as a concern. This would be no different if the open space were a separate parcel. Part of the geometry for the open space is that we do have to provide a 50' buffer along the rear boundary of the property, otherwise the lots need to conform to the local zoning district. Those areas could be pinned in the field or a placard could be put up. P. Amato said the first person who buys the property knows that but it gets fuzzier with the second and third owners, so delineation would be good. Also the Conservation Commission could be in contact with the owners. How much useable land is on 47/5-2? C. Branon replied just shy of an acre. Again, there is technically no minimum lot size in the open space regulations. You can fit a nice size home on this property. He then exhibited a master development plan dated 9/4/13 that showed the lots with homes, driveway locations and easements and said there are adequate building envelopes to support sizeable houses and the driveways are mildly sloped.

C. Branon said DPW had a number of comments and we met twice, most recently this morning. We agreed to extend the ROW per their request, and to extend the 8% grade of the road to station 3+50 and flatten out the road to approximately 3% at the hammerhead to better facilitate snow storage. We agreed to a twenty (20') roadway width as long as the driveways are a minimum of fifteen (15') at the approach. We both agreed that there wasn't a need for guardrails on this project. J. Levandowski referenced an email from Rick dated 10/11/13 that confirmed the discussions. C. Branon said this will be a very low volume road and 8% grade meets regulations and addresses any safety requirements. There will be an easement over the existing driveway on lot 47/5 for maintenance of the second drainage pond which will allow for access by a backhoe. There hasn't been final resolution to the concerns with the 15" CMP, but we agreed to meet on site to evaluate the condition of the existing pipe that ties-in and figure out the remedy. There is a cut on the west side of the proposed road and there may be a need for an under drain, so DPW would like us to show the outfall into the ditch line on the plan, that way there are no surprises.

C. Beer inquired where the driveway for lot 47/5-1 will connect because the regulations don't allow a driveway to come off a hammerhead for snow. C. Branon said we were going to try to favor the southeast side so the snow can be pushed straight ahead. We could adjust the line or put an easement and will show the driveway locations on the final plan. P. Amato added that there would be some flexibility with the 20' pavement and 50' ROW. C. Beer inquired about the design of the hammerhead considering you have an access way right across from the hammerhead for the open space access. C. Branon said the slopes on the west side are steep and would require a cut out that would be an eye-sore. This way it is a 6' fill rather than a 6' cut and will fit better with the terrain as it balances out the excavation on the site rather well.

J. Langdell stated that the road name will need to be changed as Ball Ct is too similar to Ball Hill Rd per Ambulance and E911 comments. C. Branon said they will submit a new name to staff.

C. Branon said all eight environmental comments will be addressed with the stormwater permitting process. We met with Mr. Elkind and a little more detail and interaction will be required to secure that permit. J. Langdell explained that there are specific processes required that the applicant has to go through for drainage and stormwater management, to reassure the abutters' concerns.

C. Branon stated that Kent Chappell did meet with the Fire Department and we will not be proposing sprinkler systems for this project. The Fire Department deferred some of their comments to our meeting with DPW for the

roadway design. The road meets all regulations and we are not requesting any waivers. There is an 8% grade and we agreed to make the driveways wider which will help to access the lots. The development of the lots will be close to the road and there won't be long driveways to contend with.

P. Amato said the Planning Board has been discussing neighborhoods, and this looks like it will be a nice little neighborhood. The slope is not excessive and these won't be back lots. C. Branon distributed sample renditions of houses that will be similar to the new ones on Mile Slip Rd.

J. Langdell noted that both Ambulance concerns have been discussed and addressed.

J. Langdell said that staff had a concern about the amount of shrubbery and trees that would be removed from the front part of the lot in that may affect mitigation of the steep slopes, drainage and runoff. C. Branon said the open space cluster will minimize the overall impact of the site. The road and drainage construction will be approximately 60,000 SF and will trigger an EPA Stormwater NOI, and the goal is to cut only what is needed and that intent will be carried forward for lot development. Trees make the development more marketable. J. Langdell said we've seen developments come in where the land is stripped of everything that is growing on the front of the lot to put a house in. We all understand that you could leave existing trees and mountain laurel and the first homeowner could hire a timberer and cut it all out. C. Branon again referred to the development master plan and said it is in the interest of the developers to maintain a rural setting and we don't foresee this as being clear-cut by any means. Two of the lots are already developed.

J. Plant said she has a problem with that homeowner being responsible for this open space, as in paying for the taxes and having no control over what happens to it and I think that just sets up for real problems down the road. C. Branon said he appreciates the concerns, but if the Conservation Commission is willing to manage the open space, then that takes care of any long term issues and property creep can happen no matter who owns the land. J. Plant said that still doesn't cover the issue of that property owner paying taxes on that land. Although they may know the restrictions up front, a year or two down the road, it is forgotten and they use the land. J. Langdell said that puts the onus on the Town and the Conservation Commission to do an adequate to excellent job of making sure that if we have a vested interest in this easement and open space, we work with the property owners. I understand about the burden of taxes with some limitation of what they can do in the open space. J. Plant then inquired about insurance and liability of that property and a lengthy discussion ensued. C. Branon said this is a very common form of ownership and it is allowed within your Ordinance. With ownership like this we can provide more open space. If we make this a separate lot, there is no incentive for doing 100% more open space and it has an impact on the development with reduced lots. We might as well absorb the additional open space and make the lots 1-2 acres and only preserve what we have to. This proposal offers a long term land preservation solution. J. Levandowski added that this is unique because the acreage is much different from the typical developments that come before the Board where the open space is divided evenly among all the lots, although we have seen open space ownership like this before. S. Robinson asked for an example of this type of ownership in the area. C. Branon noted that Cadran Crossing open space is owned by a homeowner's association and the developer is having a hard time selling those lots because of that. P. Amato added that the Conservation Commission does an excellent job of managing other private easements and hopefully when the lots are sold, the Commission can go out there and discuss and advise the owners about what is involved with the easement. It's great that the Commission is willing to take on that burden and to do that year after year. J. Langdell ended a discussion pertaining to liability and insurance by stating that personal responsibility also plays a role. She then read option #2 from the Conservation memo dated 10/14/13 and said clearly the Commission is onboard with this option.

Chairperson Langdell opened the public portion of the hearing.

P. Barlow asked why six lots. I have the commercial land to the north and don't want people thinking this is property they can just go walking through and park in my yard. Melendy Rd is a heavily traveled road to get to Ball Hill Rd, Osgood Rd, and Rte 13. Will the old house come down? K. Chappell said it will be staying and counted as one of the six. P. Barlow said he's been here a long time. The water comes down unbelievably and his backyard gets flooded, so he'd like to know where all the water will be going when they start developing this land. Also, where the open land is going to be; it's almost straight up and nobody is going to use it or they'll get hurt. P. Amato explained that according to the Town regulations they can do seven lots based on this amount of

land so we don't have reason to not permit five or seven lots in this development, but they have proved that six lots work well.

B. Zaryckyj said he agrees with Paul; when it rains, it rains and all that water comes down the hill so he too has concerns. He looks forward to hearing the findings of the additional environmental work and studies. When we decided to build on that road, it had a very rural character and as much as I appreciate the use of open space, I get the sense that the houses are going to look like you are coming into Nashua. J. Langdell showed the visuals. S. Robinson said they look like nice craftsman type homes, and will be under 2,000 SF. K. Chappell confirmed that the development would consist of smaller homes with two car garages. B. Zaryckyj said there is also the landscape that all the abutters are used to now and I worry that removing the trees will make it look like a very different place and it will change the look of the area, although I am sure developer has the community's interest at heart. J. Langdell said the Planning Board appreciates your concerns and has discussed this as we grapple with growth, the where, and the how. It is a challenge to maintain a sense of what makes Milford special and to keep the rural aspect. That being said, these people have purchased the property and have a right to develop it.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

C. Branon said we did submit a fully engineered stormwater management report and drainage plan and reiterated that there will be no increase in runoff resulting from this project. Mr. Elkind's comments pertain to filing the EPA NOI and submitting a copy of that to the town. It was also requested that we show the development infiltration for a 1" storm event which is not included in the stormwater report. That report was submitted with the application. If you look at the site, the house to the north was recently demolished, but there was a house on that lot and the new location will provide more buffering. We are also preserving the house on lot 47/5. The setting of this development will offer a sense of separation from Melendy Rd and it will look much better than what previously existed.

J. Langdell asked if the roadway would be going through any stonewalls so that the stones could be re-incorporated. C. Branon said the plan and profile sheet shows a ROW along an interior stonewall only.

J. Langdell reviewed staff recommendations, adding a few as discussed tonight.

Adjust the driveway location if needed,

Add the placard for the easement on lot 47/5-2 as part of the easement process.

Revise recommendation #1 on the staff memo to add "and complete the stormwater permit approval process."

P. Amato inquired if the applicant had any issues with the staff comments. C. Branon said they didn't have any concerns with the comments or with the request to install the placard. Typically the local commission has the placards and we will follow up with them. J. Langdell noted that the wording would be in conjunction with the open space easement.

J. Levandowski added that the undeveloped lots, 47/5-1 through 47/5-4, are subject to applicable police and library fees. Staff has no problem working with the applicant to meet all conditions.

J. Langdell said the ownership of the open space will be identified on recommendation #9 and the easement language will be reviewed by Planning Staff and the Conservation Commission and will be recorded with the final plan. Is the math on recommendation #8 correct? C. Branon replied that would be corrected as it is more like 110%. P. Amato asked if recommendation #5 pertained to obtaining a stormwater permit. C. Branon said that note was for the State requirements. P. Amato noted that a stormwater permit will be required, per Fred Elkind's comments on the staff memo. C. Branon stated that many of the items in the staff memo are not conditions of approval and modifications will be made to address concerns. J. Langdell said there was a lot to start with, but not all items in the staff memo were brought forward to staff recommendations, so as a technicality, the Board wants to make sure that everything gets addressed. C. Branon said the design meets the standards and regulations; we've just met with the departments and agreed to make adjustments to improve the project. P. Amato wanted to make sure the applicant doesn't get caught in situations like the pavement width, where 20' meets our requirements. J. Langdell said no one around this table has a concern with 20' versus 24' roadway width; however, this plan is being moved through rather rapidly, as requested, and there are a lot of details so this

Board wants to make sure that everything is done correctly on behalf of the Town of Milford and the constituents that we represent.

Following a lengthy discussion on the wording for recommendations and conditions, P. Amato gave the applicant an option to take the entire staff memo as a whole for the conditions of approval and work with staff or to table the application to the next meeting to work everything out with the individual departments and come back with resolution and the easement drafts. C. Branon replied, after a brief consultation with the applicant, that they would like to proceed with conditional approval and are comfortable working with staff to iron out any outstanding items in the staff memo. In reality, a number of these items have already been addressed.

J. Levandowski reviewed the easement process. J. Langdell stated we would like to see a copy of the easement before signing. J. Levandowski added that the Conservation Commission would most likely want Town Counsel to review the documents as well.

P. Amato made a motion to grant conditional approval of the proposed subdivision application, subject to the entirety of the Staff Memo dated 10/15/13 including staff recommendations and any other outstanding items in the staff memo as discussed at the 10/15/13 meeting. C. Beer seconded. K. Bauer, P. Amato, S. Robinson, J. Langdell, and C. Beer voted in the affirmative. J. Plant and S. Duncanson voted in the negative and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2.

St. Joseph Hospital – Nashua St – Map 31, Lot 32; Design review of a new medical building with associated site improvements.

No abutters were present.

Chairperson Langdell stated that the applicant has submitted a request to table this application to the 11/19/13 meeting, to gather additional information and as you may know, they are going before the ZBA this week for a variance.

C. Beer made a motion to table the design review application to 11/19/13. P. Amato seconded and all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40pm; P. Amato made the motion and C. Beer seconded with all in favor.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 15, 2013 PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING APPROVED NOV 19, 2013